

19 June 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Conversation with Senator Howard Baker (R., Tenn.)

1. This afternoon, Senator Howard Baker called me and, in my absence, talked with [redacted] The Senator said that some months ago we had briefed him on the Soviet ABM system and that in view of Senator Cooper's current efforts on the floor regarding the American ABM problem, Senator Baker would like us to give him an updated briefing on the Soviet ABM system. He added that he would like advice on what parts of the briefing he could use on the floor, and suggested that he might invite other senators to attend our briefing if we wished. He went on to explain that the ABM problem will reach the Senate floor on Monday, 24 June, and he would, therefore, like to be briefed on Thursday, 20 June, since the Senate will be discussing the tax bill on Friday.

25X1

2. After consulting with the Director, I called Senator Baker and told him I would be glad to come to his office tomorrow afternoon to discuss the above matter if he thought it would be worth his time. I pointed out, however, that there had been little significant change in the Soviet ABM picture since his earlier briefing and that although we were still studying the problem, I doubted we had anything of major significance to add to what the Senator already knew. I said I realized there was considerable interest in this subject, and that I rather had the impression that the resulting speculation may have escalated the matter out of proportion to what the facts as we know them would justify. The Senator asked what sort of escalation I was talking about. I said this was only an impression, but I thought from some of the calls we had received from around town, and from some press articles, it appeared that some people might be overreading the situation.

3. The Senator said that he had mentioned his earlier briefing on this subject at a Republican Policy Committee meeting Tuesday (the 18th) and he wondered if this was what I was referring to when I said the problem had "escalated." I assured him this was not the case, explaining that apparent interest in the subject had started some days before. He seemed relieved. The Senator said he had his notes from the earlier briefing and he didn't want to say anything on the floor that might get us in trouble. He said he had the impression that we "didn't want to get caught in the middle." I told him this was not our main concern, that I would be happy to come to his office any time around noon or afternoon tomorrow and tell him what I could, but I simply didn't want to take up his time unless it would be worth his while. I emphasized that we wanted to be fully responsive to any questions the Senator might have, and that if he thought it worth his time I would be over to see him at his convenience tomorrow. He thanked me but, after hesitating, said he really didn't think this would be necessary at this time.

SIGNED

JOHN M. MAURY
Legislative Counsel

Distribution:
Original - Subject
① Chrono

OLC/JMM/jmd

18 June 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: S. 1035

1. I attended a hearing of the House Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service on S. 1035 at which Carl W. Clewlow, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, and Frank Bartimo, Assistant General Counsel for Manpower, Office of Secretary of Defense, testified. Subcommittee members present were: Representatives David N. Henderson (D., N.C.), H.R. Gross (R., Iowa), James T. Broyhill (R., N.C.), and Lee H. Hamilton (D., Ind.). I obtained a copy of Mr. Clewlow's prepared testimony which he followed closely throughout his presentation.

2. Following the prepared testimony Chairman Henderson asked to what extent psychological testing is used in the Department of Defense. Mr. Bartimo stated that it was used only in cases involving sensitive security matters and then only as an aid. The same question was asked with regard to the polygraph and essentially the same answer was given.

3. Henderson also asked what is the present policy on financial disclosure. Bartimo replied that this is required only where there is a potential for conflict of interest.

4. Representative Gross also raised questions regarding financial disclosure and indicated that he is still somewhat angry over the refusal of the Department of Defense to provide information on the TFX contract. Gross' attitude toward both S. 1035 and H.R. 17760 could not be judged from the nature of his questions.

5. Representative Hamilton asked if the national security would be seriously jeopardized if S. 1035 should become law, to which Bartimo

replied in the affirmative. Hamilton also asked if S. 1035 is such a bad bill that it is beyond amendment. Bartimo did not provide a direct answer to the question although it was apparent that he held this view. Gross inquired whether there is a need for either of the bills and again Bartimo hedged but did indicate that they felt that H.R. 17760 is a far better bill.

6. Representative Broyhill mentioned the personnel grievance procedures of DOD and requested that the Subcommittee be furnished with a written exposition on the grievance procedure.

[Redacted]

25X1

Assistant Legislative Counsel

Distribution:

Orig. - Subject

1 - Ex/Dir-Compt

1 - [Redacted]

1 - OGC [Redacted]

1 - [Redacted]

① - Chrono

OLC/CEA:rw (20 June 1968)

1 8 JUN 1968

Honorable Emanuel Celler, Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your letter to the Director dated June 11, 1968, requesting an expression of the views of the Central Intelligence Agency on H. R. 5027.

As custodian of the records of the Office of Strategic Services, we have carefully reviewed these records and find no evidence that [redacted] was ever associated with the Office of Strategic Services in any capacity. This does not exclude the possibility that [redacted] may have been associated with one of the military services.

This reply has been coordinated with the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely,

SIGNED

John M. Maury
Legislative Counsel

Distribution:

- Orig. & 3 - Addressee
 - 1 - Bureau of the Budget (Mr. Hyde)
 - 1 - Subject
 - ① - Chrono

OLC/CEA:rw (17 June 1968)